

REMARKS

With the addition of claim 18 herein, claims 1 to 18 are pending in the present application with claims 12, 13, 16 and 17 withdrawn from consideration. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable, and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicants first note with appreciation the Examiner's acknowledgment of the receipt of the earlier filed papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

Applicants thank the Examiner for considering the previously filed Information Disclosure Statement, PTO-1449 paper and cited references.

I. Rejection of Claims 2, 4 to 11 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 112, Second Paragraph

The Office Action rejects claims 2, 4 to 11 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as the invention.

The Office Action rejects claim 2 in that the recitation of "columnar or conical guideway" is alleged to be an alternative expression which renders the claim vague.

Applicants have amended claim 2 such that the recitation of the word "or" is eliminated. Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 2 is in conformance with 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection to claim 2.

The Office Action rejects claims 4, 5 and 6 wherein it is suggested that a handle stop and a counterstop be positively recited.

Applicants have amended claims 4, 5 and 6 to positively recite a handle stop and a counterstop. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection to claims 4, 5 and 6.

The Office Action rejects claims 7 and 8 wherein the phrase "the stop and/or the counterstop" allegedly renders the claim vague and indefinite. The Office Action also alleges that claim 8 is unclear as there is no distinction between the terms "disengageable" and "removable".

Applicants have amended claims 7 and 8 such that recitations of "and/or" have been removed from the claims. Applicants have further amended claim 8 to cancel the word "removable". Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection to claims 7 and 8.

The Office Action alleges that claims 9 and 10 should positively recite "a journal". The Office Action further alleges that it is not clear what "at least one partial area" means.

Applicants have amended claim 9 and 10 such that the claims positively recite "a journal". Applicants have further amended claims 9 and 10 to cancel the phrase "at least one partial area". Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections to claims 9 and 10.

II. Rejection of Claims 1 to 3 Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 1 to 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious to Great Britain 200,733 ("Drescher"). Applicants respectfully submit that Drescher does not render obvious claims 1 to 3 the following reasons.

Claim 1 relates to a floor-mopping device. Claim 1 recites a handle having a longitudinal axis and a supporting body to which the handle is connected, the supporting body being rotatable about the longitudinal axis of the handle. Claim 1 also recites at least one flexible mopping element suspended from the supporting body in pendulum fashion, and means for suppressing canting of the supporting body relative to the handle.

Drescher allegedly relates to a center construction for a mop head. Drescher provides a flange E, into which fits a soft rustless double pronged nail A. The nail A extends down from the flange through a fabric head F and through a clamp washer C. Drescher is limited to providing a "face" which is arranged to swivel on a mop handle. As illustrated in Drescher, the flange E is screwed to the mop handle, thereby preventing the flange E from rotation. Drescher does not disclose that the complete flange E swivels on the mop handle. Drescher does not mention, disclose or suggest, in which direction or how swivelling might be obtained. Moreover, Drescher does not disclose a "face" that can swivel and applicants respectfully submit that if the flange E did swivel, the flange E would fall off the mop handle, rendering the Drescher configuration unusable. Drescher, therefore, does not provide a supporting body to which the handle is connected, the supporting body being rotatable about the longitudinal axis of the handle. As is evident from the description and drawings in Drescher, the body of the flange E is securely fastened to the mop handle. Drescher does not disclose or suggest the required elements of claim 1.

Applicants further respectfully submit that Drescher does not disclose or suggest at least one flexible mopping element suspended from the supporting body in pendulum fashion. As is evident, mopping elements must be vertically hanging when no force is placed

on the mop head. Drescher does not disclose such a configuration. Drescher provides that mopping elements are pressed between elements "B" and "C" causing the elements to be arch-shaped and not vertical. For this additional reason applicants respectfully submit that Drescher does not disclose the features of claim 1.

Claims 2 and 3 depend from claim 1 and therefore include all of the features of amended claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that Drescher does not render obvious claims 2 and 3 for at least the reasons presented above in relation to amended claim 1.

III. Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 14 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants have amended claim 14 such that it is in independent form. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 14 is allowable.

IV. New Claim

Applicants have added new claim 18. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added and allowance is respectfully requested.

V. Conclusion

It is therefore respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending elected claims are allowable. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON

Dated: 8/21/03

By: John M. Veral 48912
Richard M. Rosati
Reg. No. 31,792

One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200